

DeCamp amendment. I think that many of the points Senator Cullan makes are good ones and I am also concerned about the other affect that might be that all the money would not be used, that some of the money that was put in the general fund might be used for other projects, and even though this money is needed and I personally think that the million dollars or so that is raised from this is not near enough. It might be enough for the first year, but with the problems that we face in alcoholism and as Senator Merz has talked about and others, Senator Barnett, the fact of what it costs this state and the people in this state in terms of people not on the job, cost for increase in products, I think this is a very small price to pay. But I would be concerned because I am afraid that perhaps next year, the following year, when this state gets into a financial crunch that it is going to be in continuously, we might end up diverting some of that money from alcoholism to other projects and I think that that would be a crime. I think it would be a shame and I would be very upset if that thing would happen. I think the philosophy, as Senator Cullan has said, about having the people who drink the merchandise pay for the fund is one that is very sound. It is one that is very reasonable. I know that Senator DeCamp has said that he has been for this type of proposal for three years. Senator Barnett is for it and the bill has not passed. I have not been here so I cannot comment on that but the only reaction I have, Senator DeCamp, and I would agree with Senator Cullan again, I think there are the votes to move the bill. I think we can get the bill pushed across without the compromise. I would be opposed to the compromise because I see it as a watering down of this bill. I see it as being a detriment to this bill. Maybe not this year but in years to come, and I am certainly willing to take my chances as one who has worked in the field of alcoholism for a couple of years in running federal grants. I feel very strongly on this matter but I think that we have the votes to move the bill and I suggest we go ahead and take our chances. I think they are very good and I think that we don't have to compromise and water this bill down. So I would say that although, Senator DeCamp, I think your heart is in the right place on this one, I would have to oppose your amendment and would urge other members to oppose it also.

PRESIDENT: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: I have some of the same reservations other people do about this compromise. In addition I guess I have some questions as to the logistics of the compromise and that is we amend 204 first and then we try and amend 220. It seems that the order may be reversed. I know in the past when we have tried to gut bills, take all the language out and put another bill in, that sometimes we have had rulings from the Chair that the amendment is not germane. I don't know if we can ask for a ruling before the motion is there but I guess I would ask the presiding officer, maybe, if in the past, I don't know how to phrase this, but if in the past, amendments have been ruled out of order to gut a bill and put something else in because of the question of germaneness.

PRESIDENT: Yes, and I will rule on it when the matter does